

Serial No. 09/995,818

Docket No.: 122.1476

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, various of the claims have been amended for clarification, as discussed hereinafter and, further, claims 11 and 13 have been cancelled.

No new matter is presented and, accordingly, approval and entry of the amended claims are respectfully requested.

DISCUSSION OF CLAIM AMENDMENTS AND SUPPORT THEREFORE

The Amendments in claim 1 are intended to clarify that the present invention displays a plurality of circuit drawings in miniaturized dimensions on one display screen. The support for this amendment is described in paragraph 0009 of the present specification and shown in Fig. 10.

Claims 7 and 8 as are amended for clarification, relative to the description of the invention in paragraph 0025.

Claim 9 is amended to clarify the original intent as to the term "replace" in the original claim 9. The Examiner appears to consider that "replace" means simply replacing one symbol with another. However, the meaning of the term "replace," in the present invention, is to swap the positions of two symbols. In order to establish and thereby clarify the original intent, the term "replace" in claim 9 has been changed to --swap--. Support for this amendment is described in paragraphs 0056 to 0052 and Fig. 24.

Likewise, as to the amendment in claim 11, the Examiner seems not to understand correctly the meanings of the terms "vertical line" and "horizontal line." Accordingly, these terms have been replaced with --column-- and --row--. Support for this amendment is found in paragraphs 0062 and 0063 and Figs. 25 to 27.

ITEM 3: REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-8 AND 14 FOR ANTICIPATION UNDER 35 U.S.C. 102(b)
BY KAISER et al. (USP 4,970,864)

The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The present invention is characterized by the miniaturization of a plurality of circuit drawings in order to display them on one screen, so that a circuit designer can easily understand the mutual relationships among the circuit diagrams.

Serial No. 09/995,818

Docket No.: 122.1476

Kaiser et al. connects a plurality of circuit diagrams on a screen to form one drawing. Kaiser et al. has a function to edit circuit symbols and nets contained in the drawing displayed on the screen.

On the other hand, the present invention has a function to edit the miniaturized drawing itself and, further, to indicate the mutual relationships among the displayed circuit diagrams. Kaiser et al. does not have such functions at all. In other words, Kaiser et al. does not deal with miniaturized drawings and, therefore, has no capacity or capability of indicating mutual relationships among the displayed circuit diagrams as in the present invention. Accordingly, as there is a substantial difference between the inventions defined in claims 1 to 8 and 14 of the present application and that of Kaiser et al.

ITEM 4: REJECTION OF CLAIMS 9-13 FOR ANTICIPATION UNDER 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) BY MANKIN et al. (USP 5,625,567)

Fig. 15 of Mankin et al., which is cited in the rejection of application claims 9-13, has an output pad 194 in which flip-flop 191 and tristate buffer 193, shown in Fig. 14, have been replaced with flip-flop 196 and tristate buffer 198. This substitution is made by mapping.

By contrast to Mankin et al, the present invention reciprocally interchanges symbol positions by "swapping positions of said selected symbols...". Clearly, Mankin et al. neither teaches nor renders obvious of the features of the present invention defined by claim 9. Therefore, there is a difference between the present invention and Mankin et al. because the present invention reciprocally interchanges symbol positions.

In accordance with claim 11, the present invention aligns circuit symbols on a drawing in the form of a column or a row. Contrary to this, Mankin et al. merely draws a net with a vertical or a horizontal wire. Accordingly, there is a distinct difference between the invention as defined in claim 11 and the disclosure of Mankin et al.

Claim 12 addresses a feature of the present invention of "arranging means" which designates the intervals between the symbols aligned in the form of a column or a row.

Contrary to the subject matter of claim 12, Mankin et al. designates intervals between characters, but not the intervals between symbols. The present invention is defined in claim 12 and thus clearly distinguishes over Mankin et al.

COPY

Serial No. 09/995,818

Docket No.: 122.1476

Claim 14 addresses a feature of the present invention which enables the division of a hierarchic symbol into more than two symbols.

By contrast to the feature of the invention set forth in claim 14, Fig. 14 of Kaiser et al. teaches merely that a hierarchy has a plurality of symbols. Kaiser et al. lacks any teaching of the feature of dividing a hierarchy into a plurality of symbols and, therefore, does not assist a circuit designer to understand the circuit structure, as is accomplished by the present invention.

CONCLUSION

In accordance with the foregoing, it is submitted that the pending claims 1-9, 10-12 and 14 patentably distinguish over the prior art and rejections of record, and, there being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date:

Jan. 21, 2005

By:

H. J. Staas
Registration No. 22,010

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via facsimile to: Commissioner for Patents,
P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450,
on Jan. 21, 2005
By: STAAS & HALSEY
Date: 1/21/05

COPY